Entanglement dynamics in qutrit-qutrit system: DM interaction as a resource to free the bound entangled states

Kapil K. Sharma* and S. N. Pandey†
Department of Physics, Motilal Nehru National Institute of Technology, Allahabad 211004, India.
E-mail: *scienceglobal@gmail.com, †snp@mnnit.ac.in
(Dated: January 7, 2015)

We consider a tripartite system of a non-interacting qutrit pair and one enviornmental qutrit which interact with any one of the qutrit of the pair through Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya (DM) interaction. The purpose of this study is to show that DM interaction convert bound entangled states to free entangled states, which are easily distillable. Here we take two qutrit bound entangled states investigated by Jurkowski *et al.* [Open Sys. Info. Dynamics, Vol 16, pp. 235-242, 2009]. It is also interesting to note that probability amplitude of environmental qutrit do not play any role in free entanglement conversion. In this work we have used the computable cross norm realignment criteria to detect the bound entanglement, and negativity have been used to measure free entanglement. We also investigate the distillability sudden death and its possibility in the two qutrits system.

arXiv:1412.4883v2 [quant-ph] 6 Jan 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is one of the most fundamental tool for future quantum technologies [1, 2]. Many applications of entanglement like teleportation, quantum cryptography, quantum games, quantum imaging, etc. have been investigated [3–6]. All these applications need maximally entangled states for perfect execution of quantum information. But quantum states are too evasive such that they may loose their entanglement, when interact with external environment. So dynamics of entanglement under various environmental interactions in different quantum states plays an important role to process the quantum information. For the dimension ≥ 3, the quantum states have been divided into two categories such as free entangled and bound entangled states [7, 8]. Free entangled states are distillable states and can be effectively utilized for quantum information processing [9]. It is known that all the quantum states in $2 \otimes 2$ and $2 \otimes 3$ dimensions are distillable. While on the other hand the bound entangled states are noisy states and hard to distill. So these are difficult to use for practical quantum information processing. However these states activate the teleportation fidelity [10–12]. Recently, the bound entanglement have been realized experimentally in quantum information processing [13–15]. At present there are many mathematical tools available to characterize and detect the entanglement for bipartite systems in $2 \otimes 2$ and $2 \otimes 3$ dimensions. Negativity is one of these and is good measure of entanglement [16–20]. But for the dimensions ≥ 3, the characterization and detection of entanglement is still an open problem. Various criteria have been given to detect the bound entanglement such as realignment criteria, cross norm realignment criteria, etc. for higher dimensions (≥ 3) [21–26].

The entanglement dynamics of two qubit pair under DM interaction [27–29], by taking an third controller qubit, has been studied by Zheng Qiang *et al.* [30–32]. The third controller qubit interact with the qubit of the pair through DM interaction. They have shown that by adjusting the state (i.e. probability amplitude) of either environmental qubit or qutrit and DM interaction strength, one can control the entanglement between two qubit pair. This kind of study is not only useful in qubits but also useful in the quantum systems with the dimensions $(d \otimes d)$, $d \geq 3$ and in hybrid quantum systems with arbitrary dimensions. Recently we have studied the dynamics in hybrid qubit-qutrit system under DM interaction [33–35]. We observed that the state (i.e. probability amplitude) of environmental qubit do not play any role in entanglement dynamics in two parameter qubit-qutrit states. So in this case one can avoid the intention to prepare the specific state of environmental qubit to manipulate the entanglement in the system. The dimension $d = 3$ corresponds to qutrit. It has been proved that the usage of qutrit is more secure against a symmetric attack on a quantum key distribution protocol[36]. A quantum communication complexity protocol is also proposed by using two entangled qutrits [37]. So A qutrit system is of special interest as it has great manifestation and best fit into the dimensionality of Hilbert space and increase the computing power. Interestingly with the dimensions $(d \otimes d)$, $d \geq 3$, we also have bound entanglement in nature and its dynamics under various circumstances is the subject of investigation. The dynamics of bound entangled states has been studied and the phenomenon of distillability sudden death has also been observed [38–44].

Motivated from the above mentioned works, we study the dynamics of two qutrit bound entangled states under DM interaction by taking an environmental qutrit which interacts with any one of the qutrit. Here we consider the bound entangled states investigated by Jurkowski *et al.* [45]. The main goal of the present study is to show that

the external DM interaction can be used as a useful resource to produce the free entanglement in two qutrit bound entangled states. Once the states are free then they can be easily distillable. We also find that the state (probability amplitude) of environmental qutrit does not has any role in entanglement dynamics in two qutrit bound entangled states. However the theoretical investigation of dynamics of qubit quantum networks under DM interaction have also been done by Metwally [48] and Aty *et al.* [49]. The present study can be useful in investigating the utilization of Bound entangled states under DM interaction to establish the quantum networks.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Sect. 2 we present the Hamiltonian of the system considered. Two qutrit bound entangled states and reduced system dynamics have been discussed in Sect. 3. In Sect. 4 we study the free entanglement and cross norm realignment (CCNR) criteria evolutions in two qutrit bound entangled states under DM interaction. Finally, in Sect. 5 we present our conclusions.

II. HAMILTONIAN OF THE SYSTEM

We consider a qutrit (A)-qutrit (B) pair and an environmental qutrit (C) which interact with any one of the qutrit of the pair through DM interaction. Here, we assume that the environmental qutrit (C) interact with the qutrit (B) of the pair. Now the Hamiltonian of the system can be written as

$$H = H_{AB} + H_{BC}^{int}, \tag{1}$$

where H_{AB} is the Hamiltonian of qutrit (A) and qutrit (B) and H_{BC}^{int} is the interaction Hamiltonian of qutrit (B) and qutrit (C). Here we consider uncoupled qutrit (A) and qutrit (B), so H_{AB} is zero.
Now the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H = H_{BC}^{int} = \vec{D}.(\vec{\sigma_B} \times \vec{\sigma_C}), \tag{2}$$

where $\vec{D}$ is DM interaction between qutrit (B) and qutrit (C) and $\vec{\sigma_B}$, $\vec{\sigma_C}$ are the vectors associated to qutrit (B) and qutrit (C) respectively. Here we assume that DM interaction exist along the z-direction only. In this case the Hamiltonian can be simplified as

$$H = D.(\sigma_B^X \otimes \sigma_C^Y - \sigma_B^Y \otimes \sigma_C^X), \tag{3}$$

where σ_B^X and σ_B^Y are Gell-Mann matrices for qutrit (B) and σ_C^X and σ_C^Y are X and Y Gell-Mann matrices of qutrit (C) respectively. The above Hamiltonian is a matrix having 9×9 dimension and is easy to diagonalize by using the method of eigendecomposition. The unitary time evolution operator is easily commutable as

$$U(t) = e^{-iHt}, \tag{4}$$

which is also a 9×9 matrix. This matrix has been used to obtain the time evolution of density matrix of the system.

III. TWO QUTRIT BOUND ENTANGLED STATES AND REDUCED SYSTEM DYNAMICS

In this section we discuss the two qutrit bound entangled states investigated by Jurkowski *et al.* [45]. The density matrix of the states has been given as,

$$\rho(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3) = \frac{1}{N} \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & \epsilon_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \epsilon_3^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon_1^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon_3 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon_2^{-1} & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array}\right], \tag{5}$$



FIG. 1: Case 1: Plot of Negativity (N_1) and CCNR (N_2) at $D = 0.0$, (Solid Blue plot depict N_1 and dashed purple plot depict N_2)

where $N = (1 + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_1^{-1} + 1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_2^{-1} + 1 + \epsilon_3 + \epsilon_3^{-1})$ is the normalization constant. The state depends on the three parameters ϵ_1, ϵ_2 and ϵ_3. The state satisfy the condition as $\rho(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3) = \rho(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, 1/\epsilon_3)$ and for the condition $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = 1$, the state is separable. It is very difficult to detect the bound entanglement in this family of two qutrit bound entangled states. Jurkowski *et. al.* [45] have investigated the cases and discussed the bound entanglement detection in the same by using various criteria. Here in the present work, we only follow the cases investigated by Jurkowski, in which the bound entanglement can be detected by using only the CCNR criteria. These cases are as (i) $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1 \neq \epsilon_3$, (ii) $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = \epsilon, \epsilon \neq 1$, (iii) $\epsilon_1 = 1$, $\epsilon_2 \neq 1$ and $\epsilon_3 \neq 1$.

Now we obtain reduce density matrix of qutrit-qutrit pair. To begin with let us consider the environmental qutrit (C) in pure state as

$$|\psi >= c_0|0 > +c_1|1 > +c_2|2 > \tag{6}$$

with the normalization condition

$$c_0^2 + c_1^2 + c_2^2 = 1. \tag{7}$$

Qutrit (A)-qutrit (B) is assumed initially in two qutrit bound entangled states as given in (5). Now we can obtain the initial composite density matrix of the open system as

$$\rho_{comp.}(0) = \widehat{\rho}_{AB} \otimes \rho_c, \tag{8}$$

where ρ_c is the density matrix of qutrit (C). The time evolution of the density matrix is given by

$$\rho_{comp.}(t) = U(t)\rho_{comp.}(0)U^{\dagger}(t), \tag{9}$$

where U(t) is unitary time evolution operator given in (4). Taking partial trace of $\rho_{com.}(t)$ over the basis of environmental qutrit (C) leaves the reduced density matrix ρ^{AB} in the state as

$$\rho^{AB} = Ptr_c[\rho_{comp.}(t)]. \tag{10}$$

Thus we obtain the reduced density matrix ρ^{AB} by using the normalization condition given in Eq. (7). The reduced density matrix correlated qutrit (A)-qutrit (B) after the environmental interaction has been obtained as given below.

$$\rho^{\mathrm{AB}} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & 0 & X_{13} & 0 & X_{15} & 0 & X_{17} & 0 & X_{19} \\ 0 & X_{22} & 0 & X_{24} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ X_{31} & 0 & X_{33} & 0 & X_{35} & 0 & X_{37} & 0 & X_{39} \\ 0 & X_{42} & 0 & X_{44} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ X_{51} & 0 & X_{53} & 0 & X_{55} & 0 & X_{57} & 0 & X_{59} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & X_{66} & 0 & X_{68} & 0 \\ X_{71} & 0 & X_{73} & 0 & X_{75} & 0 & X_{77} & 0 & X_{79} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & X_{86} & 0 & X_{88} & 0 \\ X_{91} & 0 & X_{93} & 0 & X_{95} & 0 & X_{97} & 0 & X_{99} \end{bmatrix} \tag{11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&X_{11} = X_{19} = X_{91} = X_{99} = p, && X_{13} = X_{31} = -X_{17} = -X_{71} = X_{39} \\
&&& = X_{93} = X_{79} = -X_{97} = \frac{\sin\sqrt{2}Dtp}{\sqrt{2}}, \\
&X_{15} = X_{51} = X_{55} = X_{59} = X_{95} = \cos(\sqrt{2}Dt)p, && X_{22} = \frac{\sin^2 Dt + \epsilon_1^2 \cos^2 Dtp}{\epsilon_1} \\
&X_{24} = -\frac{\sin(2Dt)p}{2\epsilon_1}, && X_{33} = \frac{[1-\cos(\sqrt{2Dt})(-1+\epsilon_3)+\epsilon_3]^2 p}{4\epsilon_3} \\
&X_{35} = X_{53} = X_{57}, && X_{37} = X_{73} = \frac{(-1+\epsilon_3^2)}{4}\frac{\sin^2(\sqrt{2}Dt)p}{\epsilon_3} \\
&X_{42} = \frac{(\epsilon_1^2-1)\sin(2Dt)p}{2\epsilon_1}, && X_{44} = \frac{\cos^2 Dt + \sin^2 Dt\epsilon_1^2 p}{\epsilon_1}, \\
&X_{57} = X_{53} = X_{35}, && X_{66} = \frac{\sin^2 Dt + \epsilon_2^2 \cos^2 Dtp}{\epsilon_2}, \\
&X_{68} = \frac{-\sin(2Dt)p}{2\epsilon_2}, && X_{73} = X_{37} = \frac{(-1+\epsilon_3^2)}{4}\frac{\sin^2(\sqrt{2}Dt)p}{\epsilon_3}, \\
&X_{75} = \frac{(-1+\epsilon_3)[1+\cos(\sqrt{2}Dt)(-1+\epsilon_3)+\epsilon_3]}{2\sqrt{2}}\frac{\sin(\sqrt{2}Dtp)}{\epsilon_3}, && X_{77} = \frac{[1+\cos(\sqrt{2Dt})(-1+\epsilon_3)+\epsilon_3]^2 p}{4\epsilon_3}, \\
&X_{86} = \frac{(\epsilon_2^2-1)\sin(2Dt)p}{2\epsilon_2}, && X_{88} = \frac{\cos^2 Dt + \epsilon_2^2 \sin^2 Dtp}{\epsilon_2}
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $p = \frac{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2\epsilon_3}{\epsilon_2\epsilon_3+\epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2\epsilon_3+\epsilon_1(\epsilon_3+\epsilon_2(1+\epsilon_3(2+\epsilon_2+\epsilon_3)))}$. Observing the density matrix it has been observed that the probability amplitudes (c_0, c_1, c_2) of environmental qutrit have not been involved in Eq.(11), as these are canceled out in the calculations. Thus the probability amplitude of environmental qutrit do not play any role in qutrit-qutrit entanglement dynamics. So experimentally one can avoid the intention to prepare the specific state (i.e. probability amplitude) of environmental qutrit to manipulate the entanglement in two qutrit systems.

IV. FREE ENTANGLEMENT AND CCNR CRITERIA EVOLUTION

In this section we investigate the evolution of negativity and CCNR criteria. Negativity is a good measure for entanglement in higher dimensions. The negativity and CCNR criteria have defined as,

$$N_1 = \frac{(\left\|\rho^{AB}\right\| - 1)}{2} \tag{13}$$



FIG. 2: Case 1: Plot of Negativity (N_1) and CCNR (N_2) vs. t for $D = 0.2$; $\epsilon = 0.1,\ 0.3,\ 0.5,\ 0.7,\ 0.9,\ 4.0,\ 5.0$ and 6.0, (Solid Blue plot depict N_1 and dashed purple plot depict N_2).

and

$$N_2 = \left\| R(\rho^{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B) \right\| - \sqrt{(1 - Tr\rho_A^2)(1 - Tr\rho_B^2)}, \tag{14}$$

where ||..|| is the trace norm of the matrix, respectively. Further ρ_A and ρ_B are the reduced density matrices of qutrit A and qutrit B. The negativity (N_1) has been used to measure the free entanglement while the CCNR criteria (N_2) has been used to detect the bound entanglement in the qutrit-qutrit system. Either $N_1 > 0$ or $N_2 > 0$ imply that the state is entangled. $N_1 = 0$ and $N_2 > 0$ imply that the state is bound entangled, and $N_1 > 0$ corresponds to the free entangled state. If a state is initially separable then $N_2 \leq 0$ and if $N_2 \leq 0$ with advancement of time then the CCNR criteria fails to detect the entanglement. In the subsequent cases we investigate the dynamics of two qutrit bound entangled states under DM interaction. We plot N_1 with blue solid color graphs while the N_2 has been plotted with dotted graphs in all the figures.



FIG. 3: Case 1: Plot of Negativity (N_1) and CCNR (N_2) vs. t for $D = 0.4$; $\epsilon = 0.1,\ 0.3,\ 0.5$ and 0.7, (Solid blue plot depict N_1 and dashed purple plot depict N_2).

A. Case 1: $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1 \neq \epsilon_3, \epsilon_3 = \epsilon$ (arbitrary).

In this subsection we consider the case as $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1 \neq \epsilon_3$ and $\epsilon_3 = \epsilon$ (arbitrary). The initial state corresponds to $\rho(1, 1, \epsilon)$. First we plot the evolution of negativity N_1 and CCNR criteria with $D = 0$ in Fig. 1. From the figure we observe that $N_2 \geq 0$, so the CCNR criteria detect the bound entanglement in this case except for $\epsilon = 1$. Corresponding to $\epsilon = 1$ the quantity N_2 is zero, so the state is separable. Further we plot the graphs for different values of ϵ with $D = 0.2$ in Fig. 2. In this Fig. 2 all the graphs show that at $t = 0$ the quantity $N_2 > 0$, so state is initially bound entangled and hence it can be free as time advances. Further we found that as time advances the bound entangled state is being converted into free entangled state through DM interaction, which can be easily distilled. However the DM interaction kills the entanglement in many quantum states [30–33] but we do not get the phenomena of entanglement sudden death (ESD) here. We observed that free entanglement becomes zero at $t = 11, 22$ (within the observation limit of time), but CCNR criteria achieve positive values corresponding to these points and hence the state again converted into bound entangled states, so the phenomenon distillability sudden death (DSD) takes place. Corresponding to the values $(\epsilon = 0.5, D = 0.2)$, $(\epsilon = 0.7, D = 0.2)$ and $(\epsilon = 0.9, D = 0.2)$, we observe that $N_2 \leq 0$ for certain time intervals, so the CCNR criteria fails to detect the bound entanglement corresponding to the negative portion of N_2 and there may be the chance that the free entangled state can be converted into bound entangled state, so the possibility of DSD arise. We also plotted the evolution of N_1 and N_2 for $D = 0.4$ in Fig. 3. It has been observed that increasing strength of DM interaction only increase the frequency of free entanglement but not the amplitude.

B. Case 2: $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = \epsilon$ (arbitrary), $\epsilon \neq 1$

In this subsection we consider the case as $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = \epsilon$ (arbitrary), $\epsilon \neq 1$, The initial state corresponds to $\rho(\epsilon, \epsilon, \epsilon)$. When $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = \epsilon = 1$, the state is separable. First we plot the graph in Fig. 4 for DM interaction strength $D = 0.0$. The CCNR criteria detect the entanglement in this case except $\epsilon = 1$. Further we plotted the graphs for different values of ϵ and DM interaction, $D = 0.2$ in Fig. 5. Observing the graphs of Fig. 5 we conclude that at



FIG. 4: Case 2: Plot of Negativity (N_1) and CCNR (N_2) criteria vs. ϵ for $D = 0.0$, (Solid blue plot depict N_1 and dashed purple plot depict N_2

$t = 0$ the quantity $N_2 > 0$, so the state is initially bound entangled and hence it can be free as time advances. Further as time advances the value of N_1 becomes greater than zero and hence the state is converted from bound to free entangled state, which is easily distillable. But for some time intervals the value of N_2 becomes negative, in this case the CCNR criteria do not detect the bound entanglement, so there is a chance to convert the free entangled state into bound entangled one and hence the possibility of DSD arise. We also have the plots with ($\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = \epsilon = 1.1$) and ($\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = \epsilon = 1.5$). In these plots we observe that initially ($t = 0$) the state is separable, but as time advances ($t > 0$), the DM interaction produce the entanglement in the state and makes it periodically separable and entangled one. The amplitude of free entanglement achieved as 0.1. For $\epsilon = 1.1$ and $\epsilon = 1.5$, there is smooth oscillations of free entanglement. Again we have not found the phenomena of ESD in this case.

C. Case 3: $\epsilon_1 = 1$, $\epsilon_2 \neq 1$ and $\epsilon_3 \neq 1$.

In this subsection we have investigated the case $\epsilon_1 = 1$, and arbitrary values of ϵ_2 and ϵ_3 ($\neq 1$). The initial state correspond to $\rho(1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3)$. We have plots for arbitrary values of ϵ_2 ($\neq 1$) and ϵ_3 ($\neq 1$) at $D = 0.2$ in Fig. 6. The graphs show that initially the state is bound entangled (i.e. $N_2 > 0$) with arbitrary values of ϵ_2 and ϵ_3, hence it can be made free as time advances. So the increasing DM interaction strength makes the bound entangled state free with advancement of time. Within the observation limit of time ($t = 11, 22$) for $\epsilon_2 = 1$, $\epsilon_2 = 2$ the free entanglement becomes zero and CCNR achieve positive values hence the state is again converted into bound entangled state, so the phenomena of DSD takes place. Further, we observe that state becomes free as time evolve and CCNR criteria goes negative for certain time interval with some values of ϵ_2 and ϵ_3. So the negative portion of CCNR criteria fail to detect the bound entanglement in the system and the possibility of DSD arise. Again we have not found the phenomena of ESD in the present case.

V. CONCLUSION

In the present paper we have studied the dynamics of two qutrit bound entangled states under DM interaction by taking an environmental qutrit. The state depends on three parameters ϵ_1, ϵ_2, ϵ_3. In the present study we consider the cases (i) $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1 \neq \epsilon_3$, (ii) $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = \epsilon, \epsilon \neq 1$, (iii) $\epsilon_1 = 1$, $\epsilon_2 \neq 1$ and $\epsilon_3 \neq 1$. We have been found the results in Jurkowski bound entangled states as stated below.

(i) As DM interaction strength increases, the two qutrit bound entangled states becomes free as time advances. However the state again regain its nature of bound entangled state at some specific time i.e. ($t = 11, 22$). So the phenomenon of DSD takes place. The increasing DM interaction strength only increase the frequency of oscillations of the free entanglement but not the amplitude.



FIG. 5: Case 2: Plot of Negativity (N_1) and CCNR (N_2) vs. t, (Solid blue plot depict N_1 and dashed purple plot depict N_2)

(ii) The probability amplitude of environmental qutrit do not play any role in free entanglement conversion in two qutrit bound entangled states. In case of controlling the free entanglement, only manipulation of DM interaction strength can be utilized. So one can avoid the intention of preparation of environmental qutrit in a specific state to control the free entanglement.
(iii) However the CCNR criteria becomes negative for certain time interval with some values of parameters ϵ_1, ϵ_2 and ϵ_3. In this case the CCNR criteria fail to detect the bound entanglement in the system, so the possibility of DSD also has been investigated.
(iv)We have not found the phenomena of ESD induced by DM interaction in two qutrits in the present case. The present study can be useful in investigating the utilization of bound entanglement with external DM interaction in quantum information processing.



FIG. 6: Case 3: Plot of Negativity (N_1) and CCNR (N_2) vs. t for $D = 0.2$, ($\epsilon_2 = 0.1, \epsilon_3 = 1.0$), ($\epsilon_2 = 0.1, \epsilon_3 = 2.0$), ($\epsilon_2 = 2.0, \epsilon_3 = 2.0$), ($\epsilon_2 = 1.0, \epsilon_3 = 0.1$), ($\epsilon_2 = 2.0, \epsilon_3 = 0.1$), ($\epsilon_2 = 4.0, \epsilon_3 = 4.0$) (Solid blue plot depict N_1 and dashed purple plot depict N_2)

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, (1935) 777.
[2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, UK, 2000).
[3] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, (1993) 1895.
[4] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, (1991) 661.
[5] D. Meyer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, (1999) 1052.
[6] L. Lugiato, J. Opt. B: Quant. Semi. Opt., **4**, (2002) 3.
[7] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, (1998) 5239.
[8] P. Horodecki, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **1**, (2001) 45.
[9] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, (1998) 5239.
[10] P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, (1999) 1056.
[11] W. Dr and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A.* **62**, (2000) 022302.
[12] F. Kaneda, R. Shimizu, S. Ishizaka, Y. Mitsumori, H. Kosaka, and K. Edamatsu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, (2012) 040501.
[13] E. Amselem and M. Bourennane, *Nature Phy.* **109**, (2009) 040501.
[14] J. Lavoie, R. Kaltenbaek, M. Piani, and K.J. Resch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, (2010) 130501.
[15] E. Amselem, M. Sadiq, and M. Bourennane, *Scientific Reports* **3**, (2013) 1966.
[16] A. Peres, *Quantum theory: concepts and methods* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands, 1995); *Phys. Lett. A* **202**, (1995) 16.
[17] E. Schmidt, *Math. Ann.* **63**, 433, 1907.
A. Ekert and P. L. Knight, *Am. J. Phys.* **63**, (1995) 415.
[18] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **223**, (1996) 1.
[19] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, (2002) 032314.
[20] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **7**, (2007) 1.
[21] A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, (1996) 1413.
[22] P. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A.***232**, (1997) 333.
[23] M. Horodecki, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **1**, (2001) 3.
[24] K. Chen and L. Wu, *Quant. Inf. Com.* **3**, No.3, (2003) 193.
[25] O. Rudolph, *Quant. Inf. Proc.* **4**, (2005) 219.
[26] Cheng-Jie Zhang, Yong-Sheng Zhang, Shun Zhang, and Guang-Can Guo, *Phys. Rev. A.* **77**, (2008) 060301.
[27] I. Dzyaloshinsky, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **4**, (1958) 241.
[28] T. Moriya, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **4**, (1960) 228.
[29] T. Moriya, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, (1960) 91.
[30] Z. Qiang, Z. Xiao-Ping, Z. Qi-Jun, and R. Zhong-Zhou, *Chin. Phy. B* **18**, (2009) 3210.
[31] Z. Qiang, S. Ping, Z. Xiao-Ping, and R. Zhong-Zhou, *Chin. Phy. C* **34**, (2010) 1583.
[32] Z. Qiang, Z. Qi-Jun, Z. Xiao-Ping, and R. Zhong-Zhou, textit Chin. Phy. C **35**, (2011) 135.
[33] Kapil. K. Sharma, S. K. Awasthi, and S. N. Pandey, *Quantum Inf. Proc.*. **12**, (2013) 3437.
[34] Kapil. K. Sharma and S. N. Pandey, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **13**, (2014) 2017.
[35] Kapil. K. Sharma and S. N. Pandey, arXiv:1501.00942, 2014.
[36] D. Bruss and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, (2002) 127901;
N.J. Cerf, M. Bourennane, A. Karlsson, and N. Gisin, ibid. **88**, (2002) 127902.
[37] Hilmart Oberst, diplomarbeit, Innsbruck University, 1999
[38] Z. Guo-Qiang and W. Xiao-Guang, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **49**, (2008) 343.
[39] W. Song, L. Chen, and Shi-Liang Zhu, *Phys. Rev. A.* **80** (2009) 012331.
[40] M. Ali, *Phys. Rev. A.* **81** (2010) 042303.
[41] M. Ali, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **43**, (2010) 045504.
[42] Salman Khan and M.K. Khan, *J. Mod. Opt.* **58** (2011) 918.
[43] M. Xiao-San, R. Ming-Fan, and Z. Guang-Xing, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **56** (2011) 258.
[44] H. Jiang, F. Mao-Fa, Y. Bai-Yuan, and L. Xiang, *Chin. Phy. B.* **21**, (2012) 084205.
[45] J. Jurkowski, D. Chruscinski, and A. Rutkowski, *Open Sys. Inf. Dyn.* **16**, (2009) 235.
[46] A. B. Klimov, R. Guzman, J. C. Retamal and C. Saavedra, Phy. Rev. A, **67**, (2003) 062313.
[47] D. Mc Hugh and J. Twamley, New J. Phy., **7** (2005).
[48] N. Metwally, *Phys. Lett. A.* **375**, (2011) 4268.
[49] A. Aty, N. Zakaria, L. Cheong, and N. Metwally, *J. Quant. Inf. Sc.*, **4**, (2014) 1.